

VOL. XXXI. -32-



THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

The Official Organ of
CHRIST'S MISSION.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Director

JANUARY, 1914

Editorial

The Mother of Christ

Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XXII.

Rome Not Catholic

Cock-Sure Coler

Letter to President Wilson.

Republications

Friends of the Cause

NEW YORK

PUBLISHED BY CHRIST'S MISSION, INC.
331 West 57th Street.

Subscription \$1.50 a Year; 15 Cents a Copy.

FEB 28 1914

Bound Volumes of The Converted Catholic.

Vols. III, IV, V, VII, VIII, XII, XVII, XIX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, \$7.50, and the cost of expressage, for the whole set. Single volumes 75 cents each, and postage. Volumes XXVI and XXVII, \$1.00 each, and postage. Volumes XXVIII, XXIX and XXX, \$1.50 each, postage, 20 cents. We hope that many will take this opportunity of securing these valuable books, which should be in every library.

GOOD BOOKS FOR SALE

ROME'S SECRET SOCIETIES AND OATHS. Testimony from Courts, Detectives and Priests. Price 15 cents, postpaid.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF PAGAN CIVILIZATION, or Watson's Reply to Windle, showing how Roman Catholicism degraded mankind and brought on the dark ages. By Thomas E. Watson. Price, 50 cents; paper bound, 104 pages.

THE POPE, CHIEF OF WHITE SLAVERS, HIGH PRIEST OF INTRIGUE. This is the title of the Rev. "Father" Jeremiah J. Crowley's new book, just published. It is a book of 446 pages, silk bound, corresponding in size and appearance to Mr. Crowley's other now famous book "Romanism a Menace to the Nation." The price of the new book is \$1.50.

ROMANISM A MENACE TO THE NATION,

By Rev. Jeremiah J. Crowley
(Formerly "Father" Crowley, of the Roman Church).
Reduced from \$2.20 to \$1.50.

U. S. SENATE DOCUMENT No. 190 of the Fifty-sixth Congress, Second Session. Signed by William McKinley when President. Immorality and political grafting of Roman Catholic priests in the Philippine Islands. 259 pages, paper; 50 cents.

SISTER LUCY AND HER AWFUL DISCLOSURES.
Price 15 cents, postpaid.

READ THIS INTERESTING NEW BOOK.

THE HAND OF GOD AND SATAN IN MODERN HISTORY

A NEW BOOK BY ALBERT CLOSE

We are the only American agents for this interesting book.

CLOTH BOUND.

PRICE ONE DOLLAR.

Special terms to agents and bookdealers.

**Babylon: Or the Divine Foreview of the Rise, Reign and
Destiny of the Church of Rome.**

By Albert Close, with an Introduction by Rev. Alexander Robertson, D.D., of Venice. *Price 75 cents.*



NV.
C76

9422



(31-32)

The Converted Catholic

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Editor

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXXI

JANUARY, 1914

No. 1

EDITORIAL NOTES

"God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."—John 4: 24.

As the reader has already seen, the subject of intention alone puts the Roman Catholic in such a bad predicament that he is uncertain of everything. In the matter of intention, there is no casuistry, nor any other interpretation possible. The law is definite. If there is no intention, there is no sacrament. And as there is no visible sign to prove that the priest has had such intention, there is only the moral probability of it on which the believer must depend. But I know by bitter personal experience how little comfort this moral probability gives to any person of a timorous conscience. Of course, if, as the Church teaches, all persons who kneel to an unconsecrated wafer are guilty of idolatry, even if they are ignorant of the fact that the minister has had no intention to consecrate, we may plainly see that the Roman Catholic finds himself in conflict with our text. For even if he believes in transubstantiation, as he does not *know* the wafer to be consecrated, he cannot worship God in spirit and in truth. On the contrary, he has reason to fear that his worship constitutes an act of idolatry. The reader must realize that in these articles we can give only a vague idea of the subject, because we must treat it so briefly. We are not writing an essay on theology; that would require many volumes. All we purpose is to show to many who are admirers of the external beauty of the form of worship of the Roman Church, and who take sentimentality for spirituality, that at the bottom of it all there is nothing but a

gross idolatry, which cannot satisfy the thinking mind and the earnest soul. That is why the first condition for becoming a Romanist is to lose one's personality. The reason is this: To stop to think, is to doubt; doubt is heresy, and the penalty of it is excommunication.

We will now proceed to consider the two other requirements for a true sacrament; v. g., *Materia* (matter) and *forma* (form). At what epoch the minister with intention, *materia* and *forma* began to be the essentials for a true sacrament, the Church has not been able to demonstrate. The theologians bring as an argument a decree of Pope Eugenius IV. to the Armenians, which says: "Omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet, rebus tamquam materia, verbis tamquam forma, et persona ministri, cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia; quorum si aliquid desit, non perficiuntur sacramentum."—Scavini Tract. IX., Dip. I. Cap. II., Vol. III., page 407.*

When I was studying theology this question came to my mind: If the theologians have no other argument but the Decree of Eugenius IV., who became pope in 1431, how about the sacraments before that date? Of course, I did not know then what I knew later about this pope. I purposed to study this subject earnestly. The first thing that I found was that the pope, contrary to modern policy, had to give a reason for his decree. Another thing very surprising to me was, that the pope, in this decree, relinquishing all claims to inspiration or infallibility when he was dealing with such a serious matter as the validity of sacraments, based his argument upon "an opinion said to be prevailing in the thirteenth century." This "opinion" was taken from a document which later on the Church itself declared to be spurious. How much I suffered at that time by these doubts no one can imagine. I said to myself, again and again, It is said that there are seven sacraments divinely appointed by Jesus Christ and practised by His apostles, and yet a pope, to establish them

* "For all sacraments three things are necessary, namely, *things* known as *materia*, *words* known as *forma*, and the person of the minister with intention to do what the Church does, which things, if any one of them is missing, the sacrament is not performed."—Free translation for better understanding.



**Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D., Director of Christ's Mission and Editor of
The Converted Catholic.**

as they are now, does not find a better argument for enforcing them than a vague opinion from a document said to belong to the thirteenth century, and declared to be spurious because it contains things which are in opposition to present conditions. It was very strange that if Jesus left seven sacraments as means of grace and salvation he should allow his Church to be ignorant for thirteen centuries of the essentials for the performance of such sacraments, and yet in this century, instead of going to the Head of the Church to reveal a matter of such importance the pope goes to a vagabond monk, occupied in writing fraudulent documents, and on his authority bases such an important doctrine, which the Church preserves faithfully to this day. This and similar questions very frequently assail the mind of any one who enters the priesthood, not for mercenary purposes, but believing himself called to serve God in that vocation.

To return to our subject, it is worthy of notice that while upon the subject of intention the theologians are all of one accord—short and definite—as we have already said, the subject of *materia* and *forma* has caused great discussions among them. They treat of them at great length, sometimes with the most ridiculous propositions, v. g., the Church has established that the *materia* in baptism is “the natural water previously blessed.” Now, among the theologians the great question is, what is natural water? And we may be prepared to see as many and contradictory opinions as there are authors of moral theology. They ask whether the baptism with water of springs, wells, brooks, seas, ponds, swamps, cisterns, or lakes is valid and licit. Many say that it is valid and licit; many are of the opinion that the baptism performed with such water is valid but not licit. They ask if the water from ice, snow, melted hail is valid; many say, “Yes”; many others say, “No,” because it is not natural water. Again, what about sulphurous or mineral water, water coming from steam, dew, dampness of walls, of leaves, troubled water, adulterated, mixed with another substance; milk, blood, tears, sweat, saliva, pus, wine, oil, beer, thick fat, gravy, mud, ink, laundry suds, soap, etc., etc. All those are subjects treated at length, and upon which there are many and different opinions, which, after

several months of study made us feel as if we were right whichever way we choose. The Church itself is not sure, as in case of necessity it requires the priest to make use of doubtful *materia* if there is not any at hand of whose suitability he can be sure. The subject of form is equally discussed. As we have already said, by form is understood the words peculiar to each sacrament. In the Mass they are *Hoc est corpus meum* (this is my body) and in baptism, *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii et spiritus sancti, amen.* (I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.) The great discussions on this subject deal with what constitutes the *substantial* and *accidental* change in the Form. And while all the authors agree that the substantial change of the Form renders the sacrament null and void, there is a great difference of opinion among them as to what is substantial change and what accidental. The reader would be quite amused to see the foolish questions treated of in this connection. Authors, as Le Croix, in his voluminous work of Moral Theology, in Liber VI., Part I, De Sacramentis, occupies several two-column pages in folio, with the following questions: The priest has to pronounce the form of the sacrament, devoutly, completely, deliberately and successively: Would it be a valid sacrament if the priest should leave out the pronoun? How long does the intermission have to be in order to invalidate the sacrament? A priest holding the wafer in his hands begins to say the words of consecration: "*Hoc, est,*" etc., when suddenly he feels a strong draft, and, seeing that a door is open, tells the acolyte to shut the door, is he obliged to repeat the two words, *hoc est*, or shall he go on with the *corpus meum*? A priest is baptizing a child and, after saying, *Ego te*, exclaims, "What, cold water!" and proceeds in *nomine Patris*, etc. Did he perform a valid sacrament? A priest, after the two first words of the consecration has a sudden fit of coughing, and proceeds this way—*cor—cor—cor—pus meum*. Did he consecrate? A priest surprised by a sneeze when baptizing a child divides the words improperly, v. g., *Eg—ote*. Is he obliged to repeat the words? Some authors say that if the words are not properly divided he has to repeat the whole form; some others say that unless with the sneezing should come such a

necessity for using his handkerchief that in order to do so he had to let the wafer fall from his hands he is not obliged to repeat the form; other authors say that even in this case he ought not to repeat it, as this interruption does not change the moral act. So while very reliable authors would consider the sacrament invalid others consider it perfectly valid; so one may, on the authority of reliable theologians, consider a child properly baptized, while others, on the authority of others not less authoritative, might consider him not properly baptized. And, after all, one feels at the end of one's studies as though he had wasted so many years to no purpose but to open his eyes to human contradictions, and to learn that whatever way he chooses he may feel he is in the right according to the authority he may elect to follow. This explains why the best way to lose faith is to study theology. I knew an old monk, who used to say: "When I came to the convent I brought with me the religion of my mother. That simple religion gave me the spirit of a martyr. Here, with the study of religion, I lost my religion, and the study of theology has killed within me the spirit of a martyr, and has given me the spirit of a fighter."

May the Lord of grace help you, dear reader, to realize that when we depart from the simplicity of the Gospel we are lost. May He who is the Way, the Truth and the Life help us to keep our eyes on Him only. "They saw no man any more save Jesus only."

In our next issue, D. V., we shall deal with some especial cases, illustrating this subject; and we purpose also to show practical cases of gross idolatry practised right here in the United States.

In our February number Bishop Ferrando will begin a series of articles on "The Immunity of Priests."

RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR 1914 now. We must pay the printer, and we need the money. Look at the date on your wrapper, and if your time is up send us your money for a renewal promptly.

THE MOTHER OF CHRIST

BY THE REV. DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D., LL.D.

Hail thou that art highly favored: the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women!—Luke 1: 28.

This is the *Ave Maria*, which forms the first part of the prayer to the Virgin in the liturgy of the Catholic Church.

The worship of Mary goes back to a very early period in the history of the Church. In the second century Justin Martyr advanced the proposition that, as Eve had brought death into the world by her disobedience, so Mary as her antitype, brought life and immortality to light through the birth of her Son.

All manner of legends and apocryphal tales were invented to emphasize her supernatural charms, ending in her being transported to Heaven on a luminous cloud, wearing a crown of stars, with the sun and moon under her feet, escorted by a retinue of angels to a place on the throne of glory beside her divine Son.

In the fourth century she was invested with a new title, *Theotokos*, meaning the mother of God; which was formally approved in the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 441.

The adoration of Mary was now fairly under way. Her praises were celebrated by troubadours in ascriptions like this:

"Hail virginal mother! Hail, temple divine!
Thou glory of angels and purity's shrine!
Thee, from eternity,
God did ordain
Over His household
As mistress to reign."

This was the beginning of the Dark Ages. As the inner life of religion was quenched its outer forms were multiplied. The walls of churches and monasteries were covered with pictures of the Madonna and her Child. The great masters, Giotto and Filippo Lippi and Fra Angelico and Raphael and Correggio and Titian vied with each other in idealizing her. As time passed the Child was accorded a secondary place in the background and the mother was made more and more conspicuous. The rosary was now in common use—the rosary in which there are ten *Ave Marias* for every *Paternoster*. So the night grew darker and darker until the dawn of the Reformation. It was in 1517 that Luther nailed his famous theses to the chapel door in Wit-

tenberg, and made his protest against the worship of any but the living God.

All hail the protest! But there is danger that the pendulum may swing too far the other way. It is important that we, as Protestants, should know what we are to believe as to the mother of Christ.

First, we believe, of course, that she was a woman: which means that there was nothing supernatural about her. It had been prophesied in the beginning that "the Seed of woman" was to appear in the fulness of time to "bruise the serpent's head" and deliver our fallen race from the power and penalty of sin. As Anselm said, "He must be man in order that He may suffer, and He must also be God in order that He may suffer effectually for all; wherefore, He must be God-man."

This is the doctrine of the Incarnation; of which it is written, "Great is the mystery of godliness, God is manifest in flesh." The only begotten Son who had been in the bosom of the Father before the foundation of the world was thus born of a woman that He might dwell among us and suffer vicariously for us.

"God rest ye, all good people,
Upon this Christmas morn;
The God of all good Christians
Was of a woman born."

Second, we believe that Mary was a sinful woman. She not only bore the common taint of hereditary or "original sin," but was also guilty of actual sin. How else shall we understand her words: "My spirit doth rejoice in God my Saviour?" That was a sinner's cry.

The doctrine of the sinlessness of Mary was invented by the schoolmen in the Middle Ages. The question was debated for six hundred years before it was eventually made an article of faith in the Papal Church. It was not until the eighth of December, 1854, that the decree of the Immaculate Conception, which is the cornerstone of Mariolatry, was issued by Pius IX. It reads thus: "*The most blessed Mary, in the first moment of her conception, by the grace and special privilege of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Christ was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin.*" For this not the slightest warrant can be found in reason or Holy Writ. It was need-

ful, however, that the manifesto should be put forth as a warrant for the continued worship of Mary. At this hour there are multitudes all over the world bowing at her shrine and crying, "Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us!"

If she herself could appear in the midst of her devotees, she would of a certainty cry out, as did the angel in the Apocalypse when John fell down to worship him: "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant. Worship God."



The Rev. David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York, and Secretary of the Board of Trustees of Christ's Mission.

"Say of me, Thou art the blesseddest of women;
Blessedest, not holiest nor noblest. Give me
No high name to pierce me like a chain
While I sit meek in Heaven."

Third, we believe that she was a virtuous woman. It is important that this should be emphasized, in view of the fact that "the virgin birth" is denied in some of our Protestant pulpits and theological chairs by men who profess to be followers of Christ.

To say that such a denial either directly or by implication involves disloyalty to their ordination vows—in which they pledged themselves to maintain and defend the doctrines contained in the historic creeds of the Church—would mean little to these men. In the oldest of such historic symbols it is written: "I believe in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary." But what matters this to men who scoff at creeds and cavil at solemn vows? What says Hudibras:

"May saints not claim a dispensation,
To swear and forswear on occasion?
Oaths are but words, and words but wind,
Too feeble instruments to bind."

It would mean as little to say that such a denial involves disloyalty to the Word of God. For these men have practically renounced the authority of the Scriptures. Of what significance is it to them that Isaiah prophesied, "A virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us?" Or what does it matter that in the account of the nativity the most profound emphasis is laid on the spotless character of Mary? For those who regard the Bible as a mingled tissue of truth and falsehood it is an easy matter to dispose of any statement that does not adjust itself to the pre-judgment of minds disposed to reject it.

But no man of common self-respect will lay himself open to the charge of traducing a woman. The Protestant Church has taken just issue with Romanism for the deification of Mary: with equal justice may Romanists accuse a certain class of so-called "liberals" in the Protestant Church with vilifying Mary by base insinuation; and with nothing but groundless and self-conjured assumptions to show for it.

But worst of all is the blasphemous reflection upon the incarnate Son of God. This is plain speaking, but the occasion calls for it. One of our ministers recently said: "It makes no practical difference to me whether Jesus was the son of Joseph or not." I should like to have a jury of business men pass upon the honesty of a clergyman who, after taking a solemn vow to maintain and defend the doctrine that Christ was "conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary," would thus openly disavow it. Would this sort of honesty pass muster in Wall Street? If this be "liberalism," good Lord, deliver us! This is

not liberalism; it is gross dishonor, rank immorality, falsehood without a mask. So must all honest and truth-loving men regard it.

Nor is that all or the worst of it. Think of the blasphemy involved in the suggestion that Christ was the illegitimate son of a loose woman! And this by men wearing the vestments of the Christian ministry and professing to be followers of Christ! I say that, under such circumstances, plain speaking is called for. There has been enough of mumbling and mouthing and weaving excuses for such men. Let us hear what the apostle John says: *"Many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an anti-Christ! Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."*

It is said that the Catholic Church is gaining ground in France and Germany and even in the United States. What wonder and why not? If the aspersions which have been put upon Christ and His mother by some of our Protestant preachers and teachers are to be entertained without protest or with tacit approval, then Protestantism deserves to lose ground. I had a thousand times rather take my chances at the Judgment with a tonsured priest, laden with all the historic errors and lamentable superstitions of Rome but still loyal to Christ as God's only begotten Son and to the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God, than to appear in the presence of Christ, the august Judge, with the consciousness of having used my sacred calling to malign His fair name and that of the mother who bore Him.

Fourth, as Protestants we believe that Mary was "highly favored among women." Well might she break forth in exultant song: "My soul doth magnify the Lord; for He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaid."

It was a gala day in Heaven when the angel of the annunciation went forth to declare that the hour had come for the advent

of the Saviour. The flight of the messenger was directed not to Rome where there were princesses arrayed in purple and fine linen, nor to Athens where there were many daughters of wise men, but to Nazareth, the most ill-reputed town in a remote corner of the earth; and there the message was delivered to a maid of low degree.

It is easy to see why she was "troubled" by the words of the angel: "Thou shalt bring forth a Son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus." She knew that the scarlet letter would be upon her breast. She knew that the world would point its finger at her. Nevertheless she bowed her head without a murmur, saying, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord!" Oh, it would have been easier to die! Yet she asked no question, interposed no remonstrance, but set herself at once to quiet expectation. Bishop Hall says, quaintly: "There is no nobler proof of faith than thus to captivate all our powers unto God and, without sciscitation, go blindfold at His will." It was enough for her that her Lord required it. "Be it unto me even as thou wilt."

Highly favored, indeed, was the woman thus chosen to hold the Christ-child in her arms and sing her lullabies to Him.

"O wondrous mother, was there ever joy like thine?
To thee it came, that message from the highest,
Such as to woman ne'er before descended;
The Almighty's wings thy soul o'erspread,
And with thy life the life of worlds was blended!"

It is written of Mary of Bethany that she sat at Jesus' feet, wherefore she was commended for choosing the better part. It is written of Mary of Magdala that she anointed Jesus with precious spikenard, wherefore she also was commended in the words, "She has wrought a good work on me." These and many other daughters have done virtuously; but thou, Mary of Nazareth, excellest them all!

Bending over the divine Child in the manger, seeking Him with tears in the streets of Jerusalem, waiting upon Him as a handmaid in the weary journeys of His ministry, never for a moment losing faith in His divine power or Messiahship though she saw Him begrimed with the dust of the workshop and stained with the blood of Golgotha, bearing her breast to the sword in the bitter hour of His anguish—was ever greater love than hers, or purer devotion or deeper reverence for Christ?

These are some of the reasons why we revere her. Let all the false and tinsel garnishings with which superstition has adorned her be stripped away and she still remains the most favored of women in our eyes. If she may not share the throne of her divine Son in Heaven, she will ever hold a mother's place in that great human heart of His.

But all her honors are reflected honors. He is the Sun of righteousness with healing in His wings; she is as the moon whose only light is borrowed from Him. Her name will be the sweetest franchise of motherhood so long as time endures; and the fire on every Christian hearthstone will burn the more brightly because in the humble home at Nazareth she held the Saviour in her arms. Her name will be as ointment poured forth; but His name—oh, there is no other like it! "They called His name Jesus, because He should save His people from their sins."

It is written, "He is set at God's right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers and might and dominion and every name that is named not only in this world but also in that which is to come."

Bow low before Him, Joseph of Nazareth and all the sons of men! Bow low before Him, Mary of Nazareth and all the daughters of men! Bow low before Him, angels and archangels and saints triumphant!

"All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all."

THE BOUND VOLUME XXX. FOR 1913 OF "THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC" is now in the bindery, and will be ready for delivery very soon. The price is \$1.50 at the office, and \$1.70 by mail. We publish this volume for the convenience of our friends and not for profit. The unbound copies for a year cost the same price. We pay for the binding and give it to you free of cost. Our only additional charge is the cost of mailing. This is bad business, but it is good for you, and it is good missionary work. This volume, one of the best ever issued, should be in every library. Order now.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XXII.

Dear Cardinal:

Although the death of Cardinal Rampolla is a fruitful subject on which to write, I am going to let it rest for a while: first, because I expect new developments concerning its cause, and second, because we have discontinued our history of the popes for the last two months and some of our readers miss it.

Our last pope was Sergius I., and, as in the case of many other popes, we know nothing concerning his death. Historians commonly agree that the Holy See remained vacant for fifty days and John VI. was elected to succeed Sergius. The difficulty is that, according to some historians, John was elected pontiff on the 28th of October, 706, while Artaud and others say that he was elected in 705. It makes a great flaw in the apostolic succession, but the reader may accept whichever date he pleases. But the chief difficulty for me is, that some historians insist that there are conclusive proofs that the reign of John VI. was of only eight days' duration, while others state that he was pope *four years*. This question is very important, because if he was pope only eight days, he could not hold the council at Rome which declared the innocence of St. Wilfred, Bishop of York, and made other decisions which the Church takes as an authority when she pleases or declares to be spurious when more convenient for her.

At any rate, we know, because no historian contradicts it, that John VII., who succeeded John VI., was not elected canonically, and he also ought to be canceled. He was made pope in haste. Cormenin, vol. I., page 173, says: "When the funeral solemnities of John the Sixth were terminated the people, the *grande*es and the clergy of Rome assembled in the Church of St. John of the Lateran, to choose a pontiff. All the suffrages (of the city of Rome) united upon a priest, a Greek by birth, who passed for a learned man in those times of ignorance; the new pope was ordained under the name of John VII." Here neither time nor cardinals nor prelates outside of Rome were considered necessary.

But that the reader may form an idea of the state of the Church at that time, let us see what one of your historians says:

"The farther we advance into ecclesiastical history, the more we are scandalized by the conduct of the pontiffs of Rome and by the oblivion into which they consign the sage precepts of the apostles and the maxims of the first Christians, in order to adopt the customs of paganism and a crowd of superstitious practises opposed to the doctrines of Christ. Thus the eighth century will astonish us as much by the infamy of the princes who governed the people as by the proud audacity of the popes who were seated in the holy city.

"The kingdoms of the West are ravaged by the Saracens, who after having conquered Asia and Africa, subjugate also a part of Europe. Disastrous wars succeeded between kings; all the empires are in a state of revolution. To increase the calamity the clergy light the torch of fanaticism, drive men to the practise of an incredible superstition, and in the midst of a general desolation seek to rule the whole world.

"The popes, instead of maintaining ecclesiastical discipline and the purity of the faith, authorize by their example the debauchery of the clergy and the monks. The Holy See pursues its policy of encroachment, not to put an end to the misfortunes of the people, but to establish over the nations a tyranny still more dreadful than that of kings."—Corm., vol. I., p. 172.

But perhaps the testimony of a pope will be still more convincing. When Pope Zachary sent St. Boniface to Germany the saint found the state of the clergy so corrupt that the prelate wrote to the pope asking his advice. His account of the ignorance and immorality prevailing is beyond description. The pope, as soon as he received the letter, answered Boniface in the following terms: "We exhort you, my brother, to bear with courage the persecutions of bad priests, and to persevere in your conduct. Has not Rome itself been filled with scandals by its clergy? Has not the chair of St. Peter itself been soiled by pontiffs who were guilty of adultery, incest, murder and poisoning?" This is indeed a horrible picture, Cardinal, which we could not believe to be true were it not for the fact that a pope has painted it. At least one of the "*notes*" of the Church—that of *Sancta*—ought to be removed as well as the apostolic succession. This declaration of a pope concerning the state of the Church justifies us when we say that we do not believe in the

canonicity of any of the popes of that epoch. So we beg for justice sake that Sisinnius, successor to John VII., be canceled. He had lost the use of his feet and hands when he was elected pope, he was the son of a priest, and died twenty days after his election. Constantine I. succeeded Sisinnius, and no historian can deny that he was elected by the intrigues of his friends. He himself was guilty of simony, as you well know he gave the See of Ravenna to the deacon Phillip, who became the most ardent supporter of his party on the stipulation that if he, Constantine, succeeded in obtaining St. Peter's See, Phillip should be made Archbishop of Ravenna. You know, too, that when the new patriarch secured the most important See of Italy he refused to renew the promises of obedience and fidelity which his predecessor had made to the Roman See. He wished the pope to recognize the old privilege of independence of the See of Ravenna, and the pope, knowing the uselessness of anathemas against so powerful an ecclesiastic, ordered his tongue torn out and his eyes put out, and sent him into exile. So for more than one reason let us remove Constantine I. from the list of popes.

Of Gregory II. and III. and Zachary we shall not say anything for the present. But we are compelled to make mention of the successor of Zachary, namely, Stephen II.

Here, Cardinal, is where your Church cannot hide what she really is. When I began these letters I said that I would be the first to congratulate the pope were it not apparent that his action in canceling four popes was not prompted by any sense of justice and truth, but by a caprice mingled with political resentment. One needs to know a great deal of the political history of Europe to see toward what end this plot of Merry del Val and Vives was aimed. They gave as a reason for canceling Boniface VI. (a German) his having died a fortnight after his election, also the non-existence of any record of his ever having received the investiture. We said then that was no valid reason, because, as we have been proving all this time, we have no records of investiture, nor even any reliable dates of the reigns of many of the popes.

Now, here we have a pope, Stephen II., who, on the third day after his election, on awakening, at the moment when he was rising from his bed to give some orders, suddenly lost his

voice and consciousness and fell dead at the feet of his deacons. If Boniface VI. cannot be recognized as pope because, although he was properly elected he died fourteen days after without investiture, why in the world, if the pope wanted to be fair, did he not also cancel Stephen II.? We have proven in the course of these letters that the canonical law contradicts the pope's argument, and we are glad that your historians justify us in our assertion.

Artaud, your favorite historian, vol. I., page 193, says: "Stephen II. was elected pontiff March 27, A. D. 752, but after two days he died of apoplexy." Many writers, on the ground that, though elected he was not consecrated, will not admit that he was pope. Gury is not of their opinion, and in his nomenclature includes the name of Stephen II. Monsignor Borgia, afterward cardinal, follows Francis Vettori in holding that Stephen was pope and should be considered as such.

Feller, in his dictionary, as well as the editor of the "Biographie Universelle," do not reckon Stephen II. among the popes, and Novaes, by omitting him, is obliged to alter the *numbering* of all the popes of the name.

By not departing from Roman opinions, I consider myself always in the correct way—at least, from your point of view, Cardinal. So we have here the anomaly of *changing the numbering* of the popes of the same name at the will of the historian. Does it show that he is taking his material from any reliable record? We have also a pope whose right to the title is questioned by many, and yet his name is not removed from the list.

Oh, the caprices of Rome! How little do the people know about her contradictions!

Again, let us listen to another Roman authority, Cermenin, vol. I., p. 189: "Some historians refuse to count Stephen the Second in the number of the pontiffs, because he had never been consecrated; but Omerphrus, Bauvini, the Cardinal Baronius and Father Petan have pursued a different mode of thinking, that CONSECRATION ADDS NOTHING to the dignity of a priest canonically elected, AND THAT HE IS REALLY POPE AFTER HIS NOMINATION has been made by the people, the clergy and the lords. We conform to their decision. *Such was, in fact, the doctrine and usage of the Church in the first ages.*"

But that our readers may see the congregational spirit of the primitive Church before the usurpation of power of the Roman Curia, let us observe the tone of some of your controversists in this respect: "The right of choosing the ministers of religion appeared so important that deacons, priests and bishops were all named without exception, by the assembly of the faithful. St. Ciprian even augments the latitude of this power. 'Not only,' says he, 'have the faithful the divine right of choosing the ministers of the Church; but they can even regularly depose those who shall show themselves to be unworthy of the ministry, after having been consecrated. They are even obliged in conscience so to do; for those who would tolerate an ecclesiastical prevaricator would render themselves guilty toward God.' Pope St. Leo himself maintains that election alone confers the dignity of bishop. He adds that the faithful of the same city should all concur in the nomination of their pastor. He formally recognizes the right of election as being in all Christians, and launches anathemas against those who should essay to take this privilege from the people to arrogate to themselves the nomination of the different dignities of the Church."

From these considerations it evidently follows that the consecration of bishops was not then regarded as indispensable to their possessing the episcopal dignity, and that it was sufficient that they should have obtained the suffrages of the Christians of a diocese to be canonically its pastor. *Thus Stephen II., notwithstanding the brevity of his apparition on the throne of St. Peter, although he had not been ordained prelate, was none the less really pope,* and as such he must occupy his rank in the chronological series of the successors of St. Peter.

Now, Cardinal, this is the argument that the popes had for putting Stephen in the chronological series of the successors of St. Peter, namely, that the investiture was not necessary for occupying canonically the papal throne. Here again we have to dismiss another of the four *notes* of the Church, namely, the *Unam*, because not only do we observe many innovations, but even one pope contradicting another, which means to be fair and just, that the dogma of infallibility is a myth. And going a little farther, we might logically conclude that one or the other pope must be mistaken, so some one of them has not fol-

lowed in the footsteps of the apostles, therefore the Church cannot be *Apostolic*. And, of course, as there has been such a continuous struggle to enforce the Roman laws, which have met with more or less opposition everywhere even to our own days, we can truly say that your Church, according to her own history and her best authorities, is neither *Unam, Sanctam, Catholicam*, nor *Apostolicam*. And that the claims of apostolic succession and infallibility constitute the most colossal and presumptuous imposture.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

ROME NOT CATHOLIC

A Convincing Illustration

BY CON TENDER.

A ship well loaded with Irish emigrants was sailing westward at fair speed, when suddenly a tempest like that which drove the Flying Dutchman so pitilessly broke loose upon it, driving it here and there, helplessly until all reckonings were lost.

The captain, overcome by anxiety and labor, died an untimely death; the mate was swept overboard and lost, leaving the crew and passengers in a state of abject dread, when, without warning, a terrific shock, followed by the grinding and pounding of the ship on the rock upon which it had struck, told the story of wreck and impending death. Upon an unknown shore were washed, more dead than alive, four-score and more souls, whose greatest wonder was that they were saved at all. With the return of strength came to them the knowledge that the ship had been dashed to pieces, and that their refuge was an otherwise uninhabited island in the tropics, upon which they were, in all likelihood, destined to spend all the remainder of their lives. There came also the reflection that the great world of civilization, of which they had formed a part, would never be able to communicate with them, nor even, indeed, ever know their fate.

Their surroundings gave promise of an easy sustenance, relieving them from all anxiety as to means for gaining a

livelihood. A few days sufficing for the burying of the dead bodies found upon the beach and of the few who had afterward died from injuries received in the wreck, and for a reasonable adjustment of their new environment, the matter of adopting some form of government began to press itself upon the attention of the more intelligent, when lo! a subject of the utmost importance forced itself upon their minds—their religion! Was there a priest anywhere among them? This question passed from lip to lip, only to remain unanswered until all realized with profound grief that they were bereft of a living representative of their religion. Desperate search was then made for prayer-books, breviaries, crucifixes, rosaries, candles and other symbols of the faith in which they had been reared; but, alas! not a vestige of any such article could be discovered. So cruel had the sea been to them that a careful scrutiny of the beach brought nothing to light save the fragment of a stole and a water-soaked and battered biretta, relics of the priests who had gone down in the wreck.

Blank amazement filled every heart. No priest! What could that mean to them, but no confession, no masses, no absolution, no extreme unction, no marriages, no funerals, no holy water, no blessings, not even any one to whom to pay Peter's Pence, consequently no religion, no communication with Heaven, no life, no hope! All that seemed left to them of their faith was the prospect of Purgatory! What a mockery that word Catholic! Here they were, alive and well, with all their needs as of old, God's green earth beneath them, His great ocean about them, His blue sky above, but their spiritual nature bereft of all its requirements. They had ever been taught that theirs was the universal Church, adapted to man's needs everywhere and under all circumstances, and yet, here they were, nearly one hundred human beings, in sore distress (through no fault of their own), and yet entirely beyond the reach of any benefit from their much vaunted ecclesiastical mother. They *must* have some intercourse with God if their spiritual nature is to survive at all, and yet, the medium of approach to God—the apostolic succession—in whose absolute necessity they had ever been

taught to believe—is now separated from them, and hence impotent to aid them. Gloom and hopeless dejection reign among them when a strange sound is heard—the sound of singing! All interest turns in the direction whence the song proceeds, and as they listen they hear a few voices, sweetly blended, singing:

“Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidst me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come!”

The singers prove to be a small group of humble folk from the North of Ireland, who, by a remarkable instinct, have drawn together in the bonds of a common and simple faith, that of the Gospel, and who, without minister or intermediary of any kind, realized that God was just as near to them, as He had ever been, or ever could be anywhere. Their belief at home had been that the great God above was their Father; that Jesus Christ, once crucified, but now ascended and become the High Priest at God's right hand, was their Intercessor, beside whom they need no other; that the Holy Spirit, who takes up His abode in every believer's heart, was their inseparable Comforter and Guide, and that beyond their realization of all this nothing more was needed to constitute them a true church (*ecclesia*—i. e., called out company) in the sight of God. Yea, for even though they had not among them a single page of the Bible, yet one and another readily recalled to memory precious portions of the sacred Word; and these, as manna to their souls, brought spiritual strength and the confidence and consciousness of their relationship to God as sons and daughters.

Without a written Bible, or minister, or church edifice, or any outward possession of ecclesiastical import, yet they were at home with God, and by prayer, praise, testimony and the recitation of His commands and promises they greatly rejoiced in the all-sufficiency of God their Saviour, and were kept in holy peace.

We leave these two groups on the unknown island to the reader's imagination, and ask him to decide which more truly represents the “Catholic” Church?

But, is any reader of this article sufficiently unsophisticated to conclude that Rome has no answer for a hypothetical case such as narrated? Ah, Rome is not so easily shamed into silence! But what is her answer? This: That in such a condition every blessing and benefit of the Church is in effective force to the separated ones *if they have intention!* That is to say, if they have a good intention to confess, even though there be no priest within reach, the will is as good as the deed. Think it over. As we do so various similes come to mind—one, that of a very, very slender thread—in fact, a thread so finely spun as to become almost invisible, yes, entirely so, until it is only the figment of a thread—a thread in imagination; and yet, upon that invisible thread there hangs a vast, world-wide, immeasurable system—in brief, the weightiest machine in all the world, the imponderable Church of Rome, hanging on an invisible thread, and forced to this to save its man-made inventions from the derision that follows a pitiless logic.

But Rome's brazen forehead knows no shame, and her lips no acknowledgment of error.

Intention! Think of it again. Truly, this would make every man his own saviour in a most unique way. Let the Romish devotee possess *intention*, and presto! he is fully equipped for all his soul's demands.

But what now is the real value of the millions of dollars worth of Romish machinery and millinery—from the pope's diamond-studded triple crown and gorgeous vestments to the cheap plaster images and cheaper pictures in obscure chapels, and the worn crucifixes and rosaries in the hands of the poor?

Under certain conditions, according to Rome's own statement, to which we have driven her, they are unnecessary, and, consequently, worthless!

What else, then, would any sensible person conclude than, that if, under certain conditions, all this frippery may be dispensed with, it is good for nothing under all conditions?

"Come out of her, my people."

COCK-SURE COLER**"Two and Two Make Four." Do They?**

BY THE REV. PROF. W. RUSSELL COLLINS, D.D.

Mr. Bird S. Coler is the wonderfulest wizard I know. He seems to have discovered something — just what, the rest of us are not quite wizardy enough to divine. Anyhow, he has written a book. I say "anyhow," because I, of the common people, am too stupid to grasp it, or to see just how he managed to do it. But he did it. And he has been making a big noise about it ever since; just like the rooster who has just laid a fresh egg for his hen. He has announced to the world the amazing proposition that "Two and Two Make Four," and then he exclaims, "I did it," and he has been crowing about it for months.

'Tis rather a pretty book—red and gold on the outside, and somewhat pretentious on the inside, with high-sounding words and lordly phrases.

Mr. Coler, by the way, is, as he confesses, a Methodist—a shining light in the Methodist Church; not just the kind of a light they like, I imagine, for he is really now a Roman candle, strayed from the Mass, as it were, into a Methodist pew. And characteristically he has shot himself up into the air, and is spluttering around in the aerial regions of fancy, dreaming himself to be all kinds of brilliant stars of every hue. He may come down after a while, or a part of him may, and land 'most anywhere, probably in a Roman sanctuary. The rest of him will effervesce.

Mr. Coler is also a politician, or used to be, of the sky-rockety type, now long since forgotten as such. Probably he wants to be remembered again; "and thereby hangs a tale." To be remembered politically one must be remembered Romishly. Methodists do not control the politics of the country; but Romanists do. So Mr. Bird S. Coler, Methodist, stands pat with Rome.

Egotism was never more splendidly exemplified than it is in this same Mr. Coler.

He writes a book and calls it, "Two and Two Make Four." Of course, two and two make four, or used to do so until the propounderings of this new Colerism. And it is

to be assumed, or at least it is claimed by Coler, that the emanations of his brain, spread out in his book, are as conclusive as the answer to this simple yet profound mathematical proposition.

But I have my doubts. I once won a hundred per cent. in a college examination in mathematics, and have always been proud of it, though rather less proud of some of my other scholastic attainments. But now I am in doubt about the scholastic soundness of the college and of my own merit in achieving that one hundred per cent. For if the accuracy of that ancient mathematical conclusion must depend upon the test put upon it, in Mr. Coler's conclusions, then I am forced to believe that we have always been in error, and that two and two do not make four, but make just about one and a half, or almost anything less than four. And our whole mathematical system is upset, and we must begin all over again, with new and strange conclusions.

On the other hand, if we shall apply the Coleristic method of criticism to the fifty-seven varieties of errors in statement of historic occurrences, in Mr. Coler's book, we shall be forced to the conclusion that two and two make just about fifty-seven.

Presumably Mr. Coler entitles his book "Two and Two Make Four" because in it he undertakes to elucidate some matters that are perfectly clear to most of us, and need no elucidation so far as we are concerned, though the elucidation of them has only just now become apparent to him.

He reminds me of a certain ignorant backwoods preacher, who, addressing a group of educated clergymen, warned them that a new and terrible heresy had just arisen and was making rapid headway among the people, and this heresy was known as Calvinism. Somebody asked him whether he had ever heard of St. Paul. And he was much astonished to learn that St. Paul was a Calvinist long before Calvin was born.

And he reminds me of a certain ignorant Irishman, of Romish education, under the parochial school system, who had just attacked a harmless Jew and had knocked him down to the ground. A stranger coming along asked: "Pat, why are you harming the Jew?" "Sure," said Pat, "an'



Cordially Yours
W. Russell Collins

**The Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D., Secretary of Christ's Mission and
of The Converted Catholic.**

didn't he murder the Saviour?" "Why, Pat," expostulated the stranger, "that happened nineteen hundred years ago." "Niver ye moind," said Pat, "I only heard av it yister-day," and he hauled off and gave the Jew another blow.

Of course, our children should have religious and godly education. No sane man doubts that. And Mr. Coler pretends to be writing to the sane. And because that is as plain and simple as the proposition that "Two and Two Make Four," he gives his book that pretentious title and writes nearly 250 pages to prove his belated discovery; for the purpose of his book is to prove—what we all know—that children should be educated religiously.

That is the *ostensible* purpose of his book; but not the *real* purpose.

The real purpose is to laud Romanism and to damn our public school system.

And he has succeeded so far as success consists in gratifying his own vanity and pleasing the Romanists. They have probably paid him well for his service; and they are now serving him in the capacity of book-agent and megaphone, and are everywhere selling his book and shouting his praise as the one living honest Protestant. Any Protestant, so-called, who can lie in the interests of Rome, is a noble creature and an honest, unbiased, fair-minded Protestant in Roman eyes.

But unfortunately for him and for Rome Mr. Coler's conclusions prove to be a boomerang upon the Roman system. For if the public schools are godless, as Mr. Coler believes, then the Roman Church made them godless, for it is Roman influence and Roman political manipulation that is driving the Bible and prayer out of the public schools. Rome is demanding that the nation shall give no religious instruction to our future citizens. And she is making the public schools godless to serve her own diabolical ends. Godlessness in the public schools, then, is Roman-made godlessness.

Says Mr. Coler: "The public schools in this country are not making for righteousness." If we ask, "Why?" the answer is, "Rome." So, Mr. Coler, here is your first boomerang.

Says Mr. Coler: "The metropolis of this country is thug-ridden. It has developed a new type of criminal—a conscienceless, fearless young brute, who murders for hire, and recognizes no moral accountability, and no social obligation. 'Gunmen' and murder procurers have had their activities exposed in court. There is a similar state of affairs in Paris. Probably it is a little worse there. This is 'two.' In Paris and in New York there are godless public schools. In Paris atheism is a little more bold, a little more positive than in New York. This is also 'two.'"

So here we have his "four."

But in Paris Rome made the atheism. Paris knew no religion save that which Rome called religion. Paris awakened to the fraud and iniquity of that religion, with its hypocrisy and greed and oppression, and cast it out. Knowing no other religion Paris became largely atheistic and godless, thanks to Roman iniquity. The result is, Mr. Coler's thugdom in Paris; thanks to Rome. So there, Mr. Coler, you have another boomerang. But Paris and France are awakening. Protestantism is taking root and finding welcome through such missionary agencies as the McAll Mission, and a true Christianity is bespeaking a happier future for France and its educational system, despite Rome and Mr. Coler.

If thugdom rules New York — and if it be due to godless public schools, again thank Rome, Mr. Coler. Lieutenant Becker, condemned for murder, is a Romanist. His gunmen, hired murderers, paid with his money, are certainly not Methodists nor Protestants. Hans Schmidt is the product of Roman education, himself a priest, a Roman educator. The Gopher gang of thugs will be found to be comprised mostly of Romanists; likewise the Paul Kelly gang, and many other gangs. Thugdom in New York is principally Roman thugdom, thanks to Roman education. Another boomerang, Mr. Coler! Your book is just full of boomerangs, Mr. Coler—so many that I would have to write another large book if I were only to give them all mere mention. You certainly have the full fifty-seven varieties. And as the proverbial fifty-seven varieties have now become something more than a hundred varieties, so yours number in the hundreds.

Mr. Coler says: "A century and a half of eugenics would leave the Catholics in possession of the earth." Again: "A century and a half of the godless school would leave the same Church in complete possession of Christianity." Then pity Christianity! Again he says: "It is plain to me that Catholicism can stand up against a State-supported educational system from which God is excluded, and equally plain that Protestantism cannot, and that the result of the public policy so many Protestants now support will be a complete extinction of their branch of Christianity and a division of the world of opinion between Catholicism on the one hand and atheism on the other." Poor Protestantism! But I have no doubt Protestantism will survive Mr. Coler and his Colored views. Yet, if such a sad calamity should come to pass it would be due to Rome's degradation of our public schools through her political manipulation and trickery. But Mr. Coler idealizes Rome. However, while Rome is gaining in political influence, through her control of fool Protestant office holders, and through such dupes as Mr. Coler, Rome is losing tremendously in her own constituency. To-day, only, I have had conversation with three Roman Catholic lay people, all educated in Roman schools, one of them a blood relative of a priest and of a nun, another trained in a convent, who, having been stung by Rome, are now becoming Protestants, and this of their own volition, and not of our persuasion. They sought us, for counsel. We did not seek them. And if Mr. Coler were in Christ's Mission he would soon learn that even priests are abandoning Rome by the hundreds all over the world. Roman education is proving a boomerang to Rome, and incidentally to Mr. Coler.

As I must not make this article too long, I shall have more to say about these boomerangs in another paper.

But his Colored history of Rome, the color of which I shall later reveal, has brought Mr. Coler the laudations of Rome. He has received and accepted many invitations from Jesuits and other Roman organizations to address their assemblies, and he is highly praised in their newspapers. And now he is hailed as a "buttress" of the Roman Church. I heard one of these lectures delivered before "The Holy Name Society, when there was a very small attendance, to

the disappointment of the priest, who, in an introductory address, remarked that the members of "The Holy Name Society" were conspicuous, chiefly by their absence. This priest lauded the lay officer of the society as "a pillar of the Church." The lay officer, in introducing Mr. Coler, later, expressed regret that he could not call Mr. Coler "a pillar of the Church," because he was not within the Church. "But," said he, quoting a priest in a humorous story, "if Mr. Coler is not a pillar of the Church he is a buttress of the Church. And the Church needs buttresses quite as much as she needs pillars. But pillars are within to support the roof, while buttresses are without to support the walls. And one must not look for buttresses within the Church, any more than one must look for pillars without the Church." Therefore, Mr. Coler is safe. He is a friend of Rome and one of her reliable buttresses. And Rome is depending to-day, for her very life, upon fool-headed Protestant buttresses, whom she despises, but whom she flatters because she needs their support. Her own pillars are poor stuff, many of them toppling over or crumbling away, and she cannot depend upon them.

Mr. Coler's speech was a very poor effort, wandering, hesitating and disconnected. The Coler of the platform was not the Coler of the book. Applying the best-approved methods of literary criticism one is led to the conclusion that Mr. Coler did not write the book, but that some Jesuit may have written it for him, borrowing the use of his name. The historical chapters are decidedly Jesuitical, and are undoubtedly culled from the Rome-made history of monastic manufacture.

Protestantism has more to fear to-day from faithless Protestant buttresses of Rome than from the product of Roman schools, for everywhere where Rome has ruled and where Rome has educated, the people are casting off the Roman yoke and driving Rome from political control and from school control, except in America, Rome's last hope and last stand. And America is also rapidly waking up. A few more Political Thanksgiving Masses and a few more criminal priests will end Roman rule in this country.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT WILSON

My dear Mr. President, I have been asked again and again by different persons whether I think that your policy on the Mexican question has anything to do with the Vatican. As an editor, I owe myself to the public, and as a minister of the Gospel I am bound to speak the truth without fear of man. I think the best way to answer the people is by addressing you, and in so doing I beg to be permitted to speak all my mind. I take for granted that your policy in Mexico is inspired on your part by the utmost desire to be fair and true. In this you are in perfect harmony with the reputation you so justly enjoy. But allow me to say that there are some anomalies in your policy which even to the most impartial mind suggest a doubt as to whether a man of your literary achievements could be so blinded as not to see them. You know the wisdom of the saying that a public man representing the interest of a nation not only has to avoid wrong, but the appearance of wrong. And if we are going to judge by appearances, they are very strongly against you.

It is very difficult to believe that your going to the Catholic Mass on Thanksgiving Day was a mere act of courtesy and fairness. The fact cannot have escaped your clear mind that courtesy to the few in preference to the majority is not courtesy. I would rather call it partiality, and partiality in a public man involves a very serious question. And in this case when one of the most sacred traditions of this country is vulnerated by the head of the nation, it seems most pertinent to ask whether the citizens of this glorious nation are going to be the heirs of their forefathers or are going to open a new era in which tradition and history are going to be set aside or relegated to oblivion. You may say that you have followed a precedent established by your predecessors, but my dear Mr. President, precedent against national tradition constitutes no law, but an abuse; and in this case you must bear in mind that the citizens elected you President in preference to your opponents, precisely because they did not agree with the precedents of your predecessors. This disregard of the majority is seen in many little ways in your administration. They may be only *appearances*, but nevertheless worthy of notice. For instance: Why in the world is Mr. Bryan Secretary of State? The mere fact that the public has rejected

him again and again at the polls, in spite of his decided vocation for the Presidency, reveals that the country wants him out of the administration. Why did you take him in? Of course, as Mr. Bryan, after his failures as a candidate, has sent his son to a Catholic institution, there is no wonder that many suspicious persons think that his promotion has something to do with it. Again, why do you retain Tumulty as your private secretary? The position of private secretary is a very delicate one. I have been private secretary of the head of my order, and I know by personal experience what it is. The private secretary is the one who knows more about the man he is serving than any living person. He has won his chief's confidence, otherwise he would not be his secretary, and he is the only man upon whom his chief relies in everything. He has a large share in framing his plans, he knows his ideas and ideals; he shares in his glories and disappointments. The friends of his master are his friends, and his master's enemies, his enemies. Now, I take it for granted that Mr. Tumulty is the most *perfect* and *honest* gentleman you ever met. I have not the least doubt of it. Mr. Tumulty is a Catholic, and I take for granted that he is also the most *faithful* and *honest* Catholic there is. As a devoted and honest Catholic, he is bound by the law of *fidelity* and *honesty* to be true to his Church. I believe that if any citizen or the whole of Congress should attempt to make any inquisitive inquiries about you his whole being would rebel against the iniquitous attempt to shake his honesty, but even Mr. Tumulty himself could not make me believe that the same would be the case if, instead of a citizen or Congress, the inquirer were Cardinal Gibbons or any other authority of his Church. I think I can safely conclude that the authorities of Rome have very easy access to a knowledge of *the state of your health* as well as all your affairs, through the honesty of your private secretary.

Now, my dear Mr. President, suppose that a general of our army, or an admiral of our navy, should take as his private secretary a perfectly honest man who at the same time was bound by his nationality to be *true* and *honest* to the Government of Germany or England, would you allow it, on the ground that he was a perfectly honest gentleman? Would it not be more fair to the man not to place him in such a position as necessarily would

put a strain upon his honesty? I should think so. From all this and much more which we need not point out, we might conclude that you are either exercising your rights as an independent man and acting of your own accord, or that you are under the influence of advisers who govern or restrain your actions. If the former you are bound to give a reason to the people who elected you and entrusted to you their safety and interests. The people trust you as a man of high character and intellect, but the people are nevertheless entitled to know your mind in questions of such vital importance as that of Mexico, where so many Americans have invested their money.

If you are acting under the influence of advisers, we want to know who they are, to relieve us of the bad impression produced by *appearances*.

As far as we know, we have no reason from you regarding your policy on the Mexican question but the one indicated in your statement issued within a fortnight after you assumed office, in which we read: "We can have no sympathy with those who seek to seize the power of government to advance their own personal interest and ambition," and your speech at Swarthmore, Pa., in which you declared that "nowhere can any Government long endure which is stained by blood or supported by anything but the consent of the governed." All this confirms once more our opinion of you as a just and fair-minded man. Nevertheless, there is still the anomaly. Why in the name of justice and humanity did you not act at once? You could have prevented such a loss of life and property that the people would have blessed you.

But what really astonishes me is your proposal as to the manner of settling the question. Forgive me, but I have my doubts as to whether the ex-President of Princeton University could make such a mistake. Paragraph C of your conditions for settlement says: "The consent of General Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President of the Republic. . . ."

My dear Mr. President, that idea certainly cannot be the offspring of a mind that has any notion of what Republican or Démocratic government means. It seems rather the language

of a despotic *dictator* such as we have seen in the Spanish-American Republics, who wants, in the name of liberty, to have his own way. If you should offer your good services to maintain order for securing an honest and legal election that would be the proper thing to do. But to dictate as to who is going to be the candidate and who is not, that is something beyond my comprehension in a man like yourself.

Lest there be some advisers *behind the throne* I am going to tell you what I know about this subject, and how your policy appears. On February 23d Madero and his Vice-President Suarez were shot to death while being taken in an automobile from the national palace to the penitentiary. According to an official statement they were killed in a scrimmage resulting from an attempted rescue. Although Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson expressed a feeling of certainty that the deaths were "without Government approval," you probably did not participate in the same feeling; and that was what you implied by saying "nowhere can any Government long endure which is stained by blood." But, my dear Mr. President, if you are going to keep to that standard you will be obliged to denounce all the Governments of the world, as I know of none which is not stained by blood. There is an old Spanish law that says, "When officers of the Government are transferring prisoners, and some one, or an organized body, comes to their rescue the officer shall shoot the prisoners and then pursue the rescuers." I could show you a spot in Spain where seven prominent politicians were killed. They were sentenced to banishment. The party in power knew that they would continue to plot and plan in whatever country they should be sent to, so a secret order was passed to the officer in charge, and when they were taken to the frontier, two men, pretending to be rescuers, fired two or three shots, and the prisoners were ordered to be killed. Everybody knew that that was a political trick, but no one protested. The fact is, Mr. President, that the framers of the old Spanish law were no others than the hierarchy of the Church. Whenever cases like this happen we must not forget that apt pupils put into practise what they have learned at the feet of their masters. Is there any Government more stained by blood than the Roman Church? When people are taught that to persecute father and mother for the sake of the Church is a virtue, and when

they open their eyes to the fact that there is a great deal of egotism contained in such teaching, they do not see any harm in applying such principles to the State. That is why you will find political criminals in Roman Catholic countries as a matter of course. Only by means of education and new ideas can they be got rid of. It is civilization which destroys, little by little, the evil effect of the Church.

In Madero's case I am in possession of a secret which I am going to reveal to you without implying that it has any bearing upon his death. Of Madero we can say, as of a certain European monarch: "In the morning he was loved by his people, he was hated by his people at noon, and he was killed by his people at night." Madero came to power with the approval of the clergy and the acclamation of the people. The Church saw in Madero the man who would restore her to her old prestige. Whether Madero made the priests understand that he was an independent man or not we do not know. What we know is this: Madero had a secret understanding with the European Modernists. They were going to buy up five thousand acres of land, build seminaries and schools, and bring over thousands of European families so as to start colonies and make Mexico their headquarters. Even bishops, and at least one archbishop I know of, were going to come over. Who the traitor was nobody knows, but Rome got hold of the secret plan, and the revolution that ended on February 18th with the imprisonment of Madero began.

Huerta has not been approved by the Church. He did not ask for her approval, and probably never will. Besides, even if he should swear fidelity to the Church he would not be believed. In old times when the political power of Rome was recognized, no Government would recognize a President of Mexico before he had received the recognition of the Vatican. All the Governments, Spain included, by their approval of Huerta's Government have denied the political power of the Church. Only you, my dear President, stand alone, denying your approval and giving the *appearance* that when all the world denies the pope the title of sovereign, the President of the United States stands by it. No wonder some have asked: "What are our men-of-war doing there? Are they awaiting the orders of the pope?"

Such is the condemnatory outward appearance of your policy,

and only a clear statement by yourself in plain and definite language can convince us of your real purpose. We should like you to comply with our humble request. Just answer by yourself without any Jesuitical reservation. First, do you regard the pope as a sovereign? Second, do you refuse to recognize Huerta because the pope dislikes him? Third, are you aware of the fact that there has never been displayed in the United States a policy more favorable to the Roman Church than yours? Fourth, has the fact really escaped your perception that, unless there be a radical change in your policy, you are going to be the last Protestant President of the United States?

My dear Mr. President, if you really believe that I exaggerate I am the more convinced that you need my advice. I should not like to be a prophet this time, but, as I see things through my experience of the working of the Roman Church, it is clear to me that your path is going to be made so difficult for you that even the commercial world will patronize the next Presidential candidate, who will probably be no other than the Mayor of New York if his life is spared till that time.

Hoping the Lord may open your eyes to see your great responsibility,

I am, dear Mr. President,

Yours most faithfully,

MANUEL FERRANDO.

OUR REPUBLISHED ARTICLES

The December, 1913, number of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC brought us many very kind commendations. It has been estimated as the best number yet published, although it was belated. It was twelve pages larger than the usual issue. We cannot afford to publish so large a magazine regularly unless we can double our subscription roll. The January, 1914, number is also belated for many reasons, including sickness in the staff and an overwhelming rush of business, incident to the season, in the office. But it comes a month after the December number, and we hope it will be equally acceptable. The February number will come early if we can manage it.

There has been a large request for the republication of two of our December articles, in pamphlet form, for wide

distribution. These articles are: "Why Must We Fight the Roman Church?" by Bishop Ferrando, and "The President and the 'Pan-American' Political Thanksgiving Mass," by the Rev. Dr. Collins.

In response to this demand both of these articles will be published, separately, in pamphlet form, and will soon be ready for delivery. We expect no profit from these republications. The price is made as small as possible to encourage wide distribution. We shall be glad, however, if our friends will send orders promptly in quantities large enough to enable us to cover the cost of republication. We shall furnish single copies to those who want them. But the postage and labor spent on a single copy add much to the cost of the publisher. The labor of mailing a single copy is as great as that of mailing a hundred copies in one package. We hope our friends will order in quantities of a dozen, and fifty, and a hundred. We announce them as follows:

WHY MUST WE FIGHT THE ROMAN CHURCH?

By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D. All rights reserved. A sixteen-page pamphlet, published by THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, at five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen and four dollars a hundred. Order from THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC office, 331 West 57th Street, New York.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE "PAN AMERICAN" POLITICAL THANKSGIVING MASS. By the Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D. All rights reserved. A sixteen-page pamphlet, republished from THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, by Charles C. Cook, publisher of religious books, 150 Nassau Street, New York. Price, five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred. In order to relieve our office of some of the labor we have given this publication into the hands of the Rev. C. C. Cook, who is a widely known publisher. We shall be glad to accept orders at our office, and they may be included in the letters our friends address to us on other matters. But it is preferable to send orders direct to C. C. Cook, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

Buy a hundred or five hundred of each of these pamphlets and distribute them in your church, or in your lodge, or in your town among your neighbors, and so help the cause of Protestantism to prevail against the assaults of Romanism.

FRIENDS OF THE CAUSE

We have not the space to publish all the words of cheer and good wishes that come through the mail, when our friends renew their subscriptions. But we are grateful to our friends for their encouragement. Our space is too precious to be used in pleasing our vanity. And we try to keep ourselves humble in this blessed work of the Lord, for unto Him is the glory, and without Him we can do nothing. Poor enough must be our feeble efforts in His sight. Yet if He makes use of them and gives them His gracious blessing our hearts are grateful and we praise His name. Our friends are led by Him to hearten us in the work, which is laborious and often attended with anxiety and hardship. It does not pay in the coin of this world. But it looks to the Kingdom yet to come in the building of the Church of this age. And we find joy in the labor in the knowledge that it means the salvation of souls. And we thank our God and our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, for giving us this service, for giving us His message, and for making us His message bearers. We pray that we may never fail in giving the true Gospel message.

We give you a few extracts from the letters of our friends in this number, not to advertise ourselves, but that our faithful readers may use them to advertise this part of the Lord's work and thus to aid us in extending its usefulness. We want you all to join us in the effort to give this magazine a much wider reading during the coming year.

"I wish to express my very great satisfaction in your recent address in Newark, N. J., as reported in the last number. You are more aggressive than the late Brother O'Connor, and this pleases me."—A Clergyman.

January 5, 1914.

* * *

"The December number, I think, is the most forceful appeal to true Americans of all the year, and will be most effective."—A Subscriber.

January 6, 1914.

* * *

"The December number was very, very good. I send fifteen cents for another copy."—A Subscriber.

January 9, 1914.

* * *

"I think the December number was the most interesting of any in the old year. If the priests get hold of that volume they will find out that the editor and Professor Collins have told them a lot of truths."—A Subscriber.

January 15, 1914.

"Rev. Dr. Collins: Dear Brother—Permit me to thank you for your article in the last CONVERTED CATHOLIC regarding President Wilson and St. Patrick's Mass on Thanksgiving Day. It ought to be printed in all the newspapers of the United States of America, and read carefully by the entire nation. The same is true of Bishop Ferrando's article in the same CONVERTED CATHOLIC."—A Clergyman.
January 6, 1914.

* * *

"Enclosed please find fifteen cents for one copy of the issue for December, which latter we consider even more interesting than the other very interesting numbers for the year."—A Subscriber.
January, 1914.

* * *

"Dr. Collins: The December number arrived this evening, and I have just finished reading it through. It is by far the best yet. The bishop's address was splendid, and your articles rank right up with it in every way. Your work is steadily improving."—A Business Man.
December, 1913.

* * *

"Dr. Collins: That is certainly a fine article of yours on the President and the Mass. It would make a fine article for circulation in pamphlet form. It is very comprehensive and convincing, and the spirit is excellent."—A Clergyman.
December, 1913.

* * *

"I am much impressed with the December number, especially with your own speech at Newark, on December 14th, and I am sure it has only to be circulated to be appreciated."—A Subscriber.
January 16, 1914.

* * *

"I enjoy reading the magazine from cover to cover. It is sound and safe. Multitudes need to read it. I trust some one will leave a large endowment for its publication."—A Subscriber.
January 16, 1914.

To the "large-endowment" proposition we say Amen! and Amen!!

* * *

"I surely appreciate your magazine, and read every word. I also lend it to some of my friends and neighbors. I wish it could be read by every voter in America. I would like to ask if the addresses that are published in this number cannot be published in tract-form, so as to be distributed from house to house? I read them one evening to some very enthusiastic patriots, and they said they ought to be in every American home."—A Subscriber.
January, 1914.

* * *

"Please find enclosed my thirty-first subscription to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC. I am very much interested, and have been from the first, in the glorious ministry of Christ's Mission. I wish most sincerely that the year 1914 may be rich in results for souls won to Christ and the Kingdom."—A Subscriber.
January 15, 1914.

* * *

"I have taken THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC ever since it has been published. It is the only publication that comes to my house that I read from cover to cover."—A Subscriber.
January 14, 1914.

"I have been doubtful whether I could take it this year, but feel I must have it, having taken it for thirty years. Your letters to Cardinal Gibbons and criticism of "The Faith of our Fathers" ought to make the slick and wily old prelate blush for his duplicity. God bless you and your work!"—A Clergyman.

* * *

"I have taken the magazine about twenty-five years. It was never needed in this country more than at the present time. May God bless the editor and publisher and all who are interested in its propagation!"—A Clergyman.

January 14, 1914.

* * *

"I cannot see how to stop my subscription. I have read every issue now for near about twenty-five years. The first issue I read was quite a small affair. It has grown in size, but retains the same noble spirit. It is always clear, truthful, courageous, and of a Christ-like spirit."—A Subscriber.

January, 1914.

* * *

"Allow me to express my appreciation of the excellence of your publication and to acknowledge the good which it has done me."—A Subscriber.

January 2, 1914.

* * *

"Wishing you a very prosperous new year, with all my heart, for I have taken THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC from its start, and have induced others to subscribe, and have interested my neighbors with mine."—A Subscriber.

January 3, 1914.

* * *

"I am highly pleased with your highly conducted monthly, THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC. Especially worthy are your honest efforts to convince Cardinal Gibbons of his wilful ignorance. God bless your good work!"—A Clergyman.

* * *

"Of all my periodicals not one is valued more than the one you edit, and it is thoroughly read by myself and others. I am intensely interested in your Mission, and wish I was able to contribute to it."—Baptist Minister.

* * *

"I have been a subscriber from near the beginning. . . . I am very glad to see in the December issue several articles relating to the President and the Thanksgiving service that he and his cabinet attended. It is an insult to the 85,000,000 American non-Catholic citizens. I hope it will not be repeated. The desire of all office holders to get votes is at the bottom of all the truckling of our public men to the Catholic element in our country. I wish every Protestant in the land could read the whole of Dr. Collins' article, as it would give new ideas to many who know but little of what the Catholic Church is doing and is determined to accomplish in making America Catholic. Many Protestant will not read anything that is exposing the crimes and immorality of the Catholic machine. But I am glad to know that, as Dr. Collins says, the 85,000,000 are awakening. That is the only hope for the stability of our Government. I rejoice in the great work being done at Christ's Mission."—A Subscriber.

Pearl City, Hawaii Islands. January 23, 1914.

CHRIST'S MISSION CONTRIBUTIONS

The following contributions were received for the work of Christ's Mission from December 20, 1913, to and including January 23, 1914. Kindly inform us if any names are omitted that should be included in this list:

J. R., \$5.50; J. L. R., 85c.; J. K., \$3.50; G. M., \$16; M. M., \$2.50; W. A. N., 50c.; Mrs. I. M. S., \$2; Mrs. B., 50c.; Mrs. L. M. W., \$2.50; E. J. C., \$5; A. D. I., \$2; T. W. S., \$3.50; Rev. J. A., \$3.50; Mrs. T. R., \$5; Miss A. G. M., \$1.50; W. C., \$13.50; J. F. W., \$2.50; Rev. R. H. N., 50c.; C. F. D., \$2.50; L. Le H., \$13.50; F. MacD., 50c.; S. D. L., \$2.10; Mrs. A. G., \$3.50; Mrs. A. R. H., \$8.50; Miss M. C. T., 50c.; W. R., \$2.50; M. E. B., \$3.50; E. E. S., \$3; W. J. E., 50c.; Mrs. T. P. C., \$10.50; Mrs. E. L. T., \$1.00; Mrs. C. E. H., \$3.50; G. A., \$2; Miss M. S. S., 50c.; M. L. A., \$1.25; Mrs. M. L. C., 50c.; M. D. M., \$3.50; J. J., \$1,000; H. J. B., \$8.50; F. H., \$1,000; I. J. L., 50c.; Mrs. A. R., 50c.; Mrs. J. A. B., 70c.; Miss H. S., \$3.50.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I give, devise and bequeath to Christ's Mission, New York, a corporation organized and existing under and pursuant to the Religious Corporations Law of the State of New York, and now located at No. 331 West 57th Street, in the city, county and State of New York

(Specify Here the Property)

to be applied to the uses and purposes of the said Mission, in such manner as the Board of Trustees thereof shall, in their discretion, determine.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Established by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

Specialty designed for the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., EDITOR.

Christ's Mission, Inc., Publisher.

331 West 57th St., New York.

Subscription per Year.....One Dollar and Fifty Cents.

To ministers and missionaries, One Dollar per year.

Ten copies to one address, One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents per year.

Single copies, Fifteen Cents each.

Sample copies in quantities of twenty or more will be sold to one person at ten cents each and mailed free to addresses sent to the publisher.

Make all checks, drafts and money orders payable to the Treasurer of Christ's Mission, Mr. C. M. Busch, Box 8, Great Neck, L. I., New York.

Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 W. 57th Street, New York.

The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates when the subscription expires. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. Therefore no other acknowledgment will be made of the payment of subscriptions in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is laborious, expensive and consumes much time and is unnecessary.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.